

Appln No. 09/609,596
Amdt. Dated March 8, 2004
Response to Office action of December 8, 2003

8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19. By this amendment claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 17 and 18 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-19 are pending in the application.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Montlick (US 5,561,446).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not shown that the cited prior art reference discloses, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of the claims of the above-identified application.

Montlick is directed towards a method and system for wireless remote information retrieval wherein the system has a central computer system. Additionally, the system of Montlick has one or more pen-based computers in wireless communication with the central computer system. Montlick discloses the display of a digital form on the pen-based computers wherein the digital form is generated by the central computer and forwarded over the wireless network to the pen-based computer.

A user interacts with the digital form displayed on the pen-based computer by using a stylus to interact with the screen of the pen-based computer. The data entered by a user of the pen-based computer is communicated from the pen-based computer to the central computer system over the wireless network.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to include a “..printed registration form printed on a passive laminar physical substrate...”. The amended language clarifies that the printed registration form is a physical object, such as a piece of paper, that is not a dynamic object such as a CRT display screen as in Montlick. The additional language finds support in the specification on page 10, lines 23-28: “These are pages of text, graphics and images printed on ordinary paper,...”. Amendments to claims 7, 9, 17 and 18 have been so that the language of these claims are consistent with amended claims 1 and 11.

Hence, claim 1 of the above-identified application is limited to the provision of a printed registration form, the form being printed on a passive laminar physical substrate, which includes registration information and has coded data located upon the printed registration form, the coded data including an indication of an identity of the form and at least one reference point on the form. The user interacts with this printed registration form (i.e not an electronic form displayed, for example, on a CRT screen) using a sensing device that generates indicating data based on the coded data located on the form. The sensing device then communicates the indicating data to a central computer system.

Montlick does not disclose, teach or suggested the claimed feature of providing a printed registration form, the form being printed on a passive laminar physical substrate. Indeed, the section of the Montlick document identified by the Examiner as anticipating the Applicant's invention (column 2, lines 63-67 and column 2 lines 1-6) clearly states “a selected form is displayed on the screen of the pen-based computer which requests it and

Appln No. 09/609,596
Amdt. Dated March 8, 2004
Response to Office action of December 8, 2003

9

data is entered through the pen-based computer by handwriting on the position sensitive display which displays the form."

As the feature of the provision of a printed registration form is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Montlick, it is clear that this prior art document does not anticipate the Applicants claimed invention.

As claims 2-10 are dependant on claim 1, they are similarly limited to the feature of the provision of a printed registration form and as such are not anticipated by the Montlick disclosure.

Claim 11 is a system claim that is limited to having a printed registration form, the form being printed on a passive laminar physical substrate. As discussed above, this feature is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the Montlick disclosure. Hence, it is clear that Montlick does not anticipate the Applicant's invention defined in claim 11 and hence the grounds of rejection have been respectfully traversed. Claims 12-18 are dependent on claim 11 and, as such, contain the limitation of having a printed registration form. Hence, the grounds of rejection for these claims have been respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



PAUL LAPSTUN



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762